DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 190 JC 030 422

AUTHOR	Hom, Bobby
TITLE	Controversial Art in the Community College.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	26p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Freedom; Aesthetic Values; *Art; Artists; Arts Centers; *Censorship; Community Colleges; *Conflict; Fine Arts; Freedom; Intellectual Freedom; *Religion; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Santa Fe Community College FL

ABSTRACT

This document examines the events surrounding a controversial art exhibit that was held at Santa Fe Community College (SFCC), Gainesville, Florida, in 2002. The author asks the following questions: (1) What is the role of the arts on a community college campus? (2) What are a community college arts program's responsibilities to the Fine Arts and Humanities students, the student body as a whole, and the larger local community? (3) Who should select the artists and works to be exhibited or performed and on what grounds should these selectors base their decisions? (4) What is the best pedagogical approach to artwork that may offend community standards? (5) What are the rights and responsibilities surrounding academic freedom and artistic expression in the community college? (6) How can diversity of opinions and beliefs be respected? and (7) Is there a way to balance responsible academic freedom and community standards with access to controversial information? The SFCC administration supported the exhibit, which examined violence in religious and sexual imagery. At the same time, the administration collaborated with the community by providing forums that allowed expression of diverse opinions. The author concludes that the administration acted in defense of institutional values. (Contains 50 endnotes.) (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Hom

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Controversial Art in the Community College[1]

Bobby Hom
Assistant Professor, Humanities
Santa Fe Community College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 480 190

ABSTRACT:

The increasing number of cases of arts censorship on community college campuses around the country raises a common set of questions concerning the scope and limits of artistic expression and academic freedom at the community college. That is, what is the role of the arts on a community college campus; what are a community college arts program's responsibilities to Fine Arts and Humanities students, the student body as a whole, and the larger local community; who should select the artists and works to be exhibited or performed and on what grounds should these selectors base their decisions; what is the best pedagogical approach to artwork that may potentially offend "community" standards; what are the rights and responsibilities surrounding academic freedom and artistic expression in the community college; how can diversity of opinions and beliefs be respected in the discussion of controversial subject matter; is there a way to balance responsible academic freedom and community standards with access to controversial information? The author hopes to provide some answers to these questions by examining campus and community responses to a specific controversial art exhibit that was held at Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, Florida, from February 8 through March 29, 2002.

The author examines the events of the controversy and conclude: 1) the controversy over the exhibit was rooted in contradictory college and community views of religious decorum and propriety (i.e., what is the proper way to depict Christ) and in contradictory values over the purpose of art (i.e., to challenge the status quo vs. to beautify) and the purpose of education (i.e., to confront the student to examine his/her value system vs. to confirm facts about the world); 2) the administration acted properly in the face of strong community and political pressures in supporting the exhibit based upon its institutional value of academic freedom and freedom of artistic expression; and 3) the college through its president, its Board

JC030422

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of Trustees, its College Senate, and its Student Senate unequivocally stated to the North Central Florida and academic communities that the institution's values are not negotiable.

Over the past five years, there have been a disturbing number of cases of arts censorship on community college campuses across the nation. While no comprehensive study has been published, these incidents have been documented by the local media and national organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union, the Free Expression Network, and the National Coalition Against Censorship. The following list is not an attempt to chronicle all of these incidents, but is an example of the type of attacks against the arts that have taken place on community college campuses since 1998. In January 1998, an installation by Barbara Jo Ravelle showcasing previously censored works and new works addressing censorship issues was itself censored by Manatee Community College (Bradenton, Florida). One panel containing images of erect penises was removed from the multi-panel exhibit a week before its scheduled opening. When Ravelle insisted the panel be reinstated, the gallery director considered her actions a breech of contract and cancelled the entire show.[2] In December 1999, Santa Fe Community College (Santa Fe, New Mexico) removed from public display a painting depicting an eroded landscape littered with tree stumps, a gorilla nailed on a cross, and two bathing-suit clad female figures after complaints from the New Mexico Catholic community were coupled with vandalism of the artwork. Three months later, the painting, Monika Steinhoff's *And God Gave Dominion*, was relocated to an obscure corner of the college's new visual arts center. The painting's return to public display prompted a new round of protests, which eventually caused the college to return the painting to the artist.[3] In September 2000, the Board of Trustees of Seminole Community College (Sanford, Florida) objected to the performance of a dramatic scene that included brief nudity. The scene appears at the end of the play *Wit* and was performed by the Orlando Theatre Project, which had been in residence at the college for five years. According to the chairman of Board of Trustees, the school was just trying to conform to community

standards and the college's policy on sexual harassment and misconduct.[4] In June 2001, more than a dozen conservative Arizona state legislators deemed "offensive" three pictures and a poem that appeared in the Glendale Community College (Glendale, Arizona) student literary magazine, *The Traveler*, and that were reproduced on a college web site. The legislators called for the removal of the college president and the magazine's faculty sponsor, and threatened to withhold state funds from the college.[5] In December 2001, the director and senior curator of the Southeast Museum of Photography at Daytona Beach Community College (Daytona Beach, Florida) resigned, claiming that she was told to cancel a February exhibit of Afghanistan photos. Museum officials claim that the director wasn't told to cancel the exhibit but was told to reschedule it to a date that didn't coincide with another exhibit celebrating patriotism.[6] In January 2002, Miami (Florida) City Commission Chairman Tomás Regalado proposed that Miami Dade Community College be required to "consult" the city on potentially controversial movies or theatre performances as a contingency in the city's hand-over to the college of the Tower Theater in Little Havana.[7] Policy statements supporting academic freedom to the contrary, censorship of the arts can and does occur on community college campuses.

These cases all raise a common set of questions concerning the scope and limits of artistic expression and academic freedom on the community college campus. That is, what is the role of the arts on a community college campus; what are a community college arts program's responsibilities to Fine Arts and Humanities students, the student body as a whole, and the larger local community; who should select the artists and works to be exhibited or performed and on what grounds should these selectors base their decisions; what is the best pedagogical approach to artwork that may potentially offend "community" standards; what are the rights and responsibilities surrounding academic freedom and artistic expression in the community college; how can diversity of opinions and beliefs be respected in the discussion of controversial subject matter; is there a way to balance responsible academic freedom and community standards with access to controversial information? This paper hopes to provide some answers to these questions by examining campus and community responses to a specific incident that occurred in Spring 2002, on the campus of Santa Fe Community College (SFCC) in Gainesville, Florida.

From February 8 through March 29, 2002, SFCC's main art gallery, the Santa Fe Gallery, presented the exhibit "Pat Payne, A Look at Violence in Religious and Sexual Imagery." Payne, a Gainesville artist who holds a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree from the University of Florida and who has exhibited in galleries in Florida and New York, created thirteen mixed media works for the exhibit. In these works, Payne digitally superimposes sexual photographs (some graphic in their depiction of genitalia and acts) from the 1950s to the 1990s over background images of paintings depicting Christ and other religious figures. Among the artists represented by the background images are Diego Velazquez, Edouard Manet, Giovanni Bellini, Hieronymus Bosch, Andrea Mantegna, Rembrandt, William Blake, and Rogier van der Weyden.[8]

According to Payne's artist statement (see Appendix A), "the idea for combining the two types of images came to me when, a few years ago at a NYC flea market, I looked through a box of old black and white bondage photos from the 1950s. I bought one that showed a woman whose arms were tied straight out from her sides in a crucifixion-like manner. My first image 'blend' was an attempt to combine that image with the full-color image on the inside front cover of the Children's Missal I'd received in first grade,…that of an emaciated, bloodied, dead man whose hands and feet were nailed to a cross." For Payne, his work is an attempt "to understand our species' propensity for violence and the degradation of others, and [I] have noted that two common sources of depictions of that inhumanity are found in religious (specifically Catholic) and sexual imagery." Payne adds, "I don't make these images to shock or offend, but to try to come to a better understanding of the concepts/perceptions of spirituality and sexuality, acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and images, veneration, arousal, morality, and objectification.... I'm hoping to get closer to understanding faith, true love, reverence, pleasure, eroticism, fear, control, power, and how and where any lines or boundaries get blurred or crossed or forgotten."[9] Payne's statement was made available to visitors both as a handout and as an introductory label appearing at the entrance to the exhibit. The statement was the only form of interpretation and educational material provided by the gallery.

Eighteen months prior to the exhibition's opening, a five-member "curatorial committee" composed entirely of SFCC visual arts faculty had awarded Payne an exhibition based upon a slide review of his oeuvre. The members of the committee were impressed by the digital technique and manipulation of images seen in Payne's previous work. According to a committee member, "We were very interested in the technical aspect of his work. We'd never had a show with that sort of art [digital] work."[10] This exhibition would be used to introduce SFCC visual arts students to a new medium and to new techniques for creating art. In its selection of Payne's work, the committee was guided by both educational and artistic criteria.

The committee, however, did not view the *specific* works that Payne would exhibit until he delivered them to the Gallery a few days before the exhibit's opening. This new work, while similar in style to the pieces seen in the slides, was "different" from (i.e., more graphic than) his previous work. Despite the potentially controversial nature of the new work, the curatorial committee commenced with the exhibition as scheduled. According to comments made during the controversy, the members of the committee were intrigued by the subject matter and themes found in Payne's work. One committee member noted that the exhibit was "very timely with all that has gone on with the current issues in the Catholic Church [i.e., the sex scandals involving Catholic priests]."[11] Another committee member cited the pedagogical possibilities raised by the work as another reason for moving forward with the exhibit. "I believe Payne's meshing of these two disturbing combinations in his work gives rise to some extremely interesting conversations…, e.g., who are the proper audience for a college gallery, what is appropriation in art and how is it related to plagiarism, what is the legal definition of pornography (and does it differ from everyman's definition), how does art illuminate (or obscure) social issues such as violence by or towards religions and subjugation (often of women) by violence."[12]

Posters and announcements advertising the exhibit included warnings that the exhibit contained "mature subject matter." However, neither the warnings nor the title of the exhibit adequately suggested the sexualized treatment of its subject matter. The most controversial works in the exhibit contained background images of Jesus Christ overlaid with sexual imagery to suggest that He had pierced genitalia,

that He was masturbated as He was being tortured, and in the most controversial work, that He was fellated as he was whipped.

The timing of the exhibit to coincide with the season of Lent and to close on Good Friday contributed greatly to the controversy. Christian groups who protested the exhibition expressed outrage not only over what they viewed as an anti-Christian message but also over its expression during the most holy period of the Christian calendar.[13] The exhibit's timing also was unfortunate for two additional reasons. First, the college had hired a new president, Jackson Sasser, whose first day as SFCC president was January 4. Although a veteran community college administrator (his previous position was President of Lee College in Baytown, Texas), Dr. Sasser's views on a number of institutional issues and policies, including the extent to which he would support academic freedom and artistic expression, were still unknown at the time. Second, the college was in the midst of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reaffirmation of accreditation process. As part of the process, a SACS site-visiting committee would come to the college in March, during the exhibition period and during the controversy.

Protests over the exhibition began when several students and faculty expressed their displeasure with the content Payne's work, first to the gallery attendant; then to Leslie Lambert, the Chairperson of the Creative Arts and Humanities Department, which operates the gallery; and finally, to the President Sasser and the local media. In response to the growing controversy, Lambert sent an e-mail to her faculty reiterating the warning that the exhibit contains mature subject matter not suitable for all viewers and urging the faculty to "please use discretion and do not make assignments that REQUIRE students to visit this exhibit." She also requested that the faculty encourage their students to attend a panel discussion on "The Role of an Art Gallery on a College Campus," held on February 28.[14]

The panel discussion provided a public forum for discussion of the issues involved in the exhibition of controversial subject matter. The panel was comprised of a faculty moderator, four members of the Creative Arts and Humanities Department faculty, and two SFCC students. With the exception of one faculty member and one student, the panel supported the Gallery's right to exhibit Payne's work based upon the educational mission of the college and principles of academic freedom and freedom of artistic

expression. According to the pro-exhibition panel members, education and art should provoke critical thinking, stimulate discussion, and encourage the exchange of ideas. This view correlates with the college's policy on academic freedom. According to the policy statement, "academic freedom provides the security within the College for faculty and students to search for truth so as to further human knowledge and intellectual growth." Instructional staff are entitled to "teach and to discuss in his/her class any aspect of a topic pertinent to the understanding of the subject matter of the course that he/she is teaching."[15] In the view of the panel, the Gallery is an important extension of the art studio for visual arts faculty. As such, the gallery space deserves the same protections afforded to more traditional classroom spaces.

The dissenting faculty voice on the panel, a professor of dance and director of the college's dance company, suggested that while she supported academic freedom and freedom of artistic expression, she did not believe that enough consideration was given to the audience for the exhibit. She noted that the composition of her audience dictates the nature of the work that she would consider including in SFCC dance productions. Because her audience includes children, she avoids work that is overtly sexual or controversial. When asked directly if she would ever schedule an event that depicted Christ in a manner such as the Gallery's exhibition, she unequivocally replied no, basing her position on the needs of her audience.

The dissenting student voice on the panel argued that the exhibit should be removed, because it offended her religion, violated community values, and created a negative atmosphere on campus not conducive towards education. She stated, "The purpose of an art gallery on a college campus is to provoke thought and to better lives through artistic education. A higher level art gallery should raise questions and promote diversity while keeping educational goals [as] their first priority. The mission of an art gallery is to serve the community and the first step in serving the community is to raise the question, who is the targeted audience... In a public institution, there should be a high level of concern for offensive material displayed in a public art gallery [that] serves a young community. I feel the main

purpose of an art gallery on a college campus is to enhance education in a way that is welcoming to their audience."[16]

Both the faculty member's and the student panelist's statements raise significant questions: what is the mission of a community college art gallery; how is that mission related to the audience it serves; does the Gallery have a responsibility to recognize the community's definition of "offensive" and decent; and most importantly, should the Gallery avoid material that may be insensitive and intolerant towards selected groups when the controversy potentially generated by it affects the overall quality of the educational environment?

The Gallery's mission corresponds with the college's institutional values of "academic excellence, academic freedom, and intellectual pursuit" and the college's commitment to "collaboration with our community." According to the mission statement, "The Gallery is committed to exhibiting quality artwork selected for aesthetic and educational purposes. The range of exhibitions shown at the Gallery is purposefully diverse in order to suggest to visitors the endless variety of art. Art works exhibited in the Gallery provide examples of various artistic techniques, styles, media, etc., and often serve as inspiration for SFCC art students in the creation of their own work." The Gallery's audience is the campus community and the North Central Florida community at large. However, its pedagogical emphasis is on teaching technique and style to SFCC fine arts students.[17]

There is within the Gallery's mission statement and the college's values, "if not a contradiction, then at least a tension," in that "the values of the academic elite may not be congruent with the values of the community."[18] According to data from the 1990 census, approximately 44% of the total population of Alachua and Bradford counties, SFCC's service district, were adherents of 217 churches in the area. North Central Florida is a conservative, highly religious region of the state. Despite the presence of SFCC and the University of Florida, the level of educational attainment of the North Central Florida population, again despite the presence of two institutions of higher learning, is below college-level. The vast majority of the population in the service district age twenty-five and older held a high school degree or *lower*. In Alachua County, 63.4% of the population held a high school degree or lower, and in

Bradford County, the figure was 91.9% of the population.[19] The controversy over the exhibit was rooted in contradictory college and community views of religious decorum and propriety (i.e., what is the proper way to depict Christ) and in contradictory values over the purpose of art (i.e., to challenge the status quo vs. to beautify) and the purpose of education (i.e., to confront the student to examine his/her value system vs. to confirm facts about the world).

The majority of audience members who spoke during the panel discussion favored removing the work from campus. Three different arguments supporting removal were repeated during the course of the debate. First, the exhibit should be removed because of the presence of dual-enrolled high school students on campus. According to this argument, it was immoral and perhaps illegal for the college to expose under-age students to "pornography." Second, the audience questioned the use of tax-payer money to support anti-Christian statements. According to this argument, the college has a fiduciary responsibility to spend public funds in the best interests of the community and in a fashion consistent with community standards. Third, the audience argued that the insensitivity and intolerance reflected in Payne's images would not have been permitted on a college campus if the subject had been something other than Christianity and someone other than Christ. The panel was asked multiple times if the college would have allowed Payne's work to be displayed had he used images of Martin Luther King, Mohammed, and Buddha instead of Christ.

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, based in New York City, cited arguments similar to the panel discussion audience. In a February 28 press release, Catholic League President William Donohue asked, "Why doesn't she [Lambert] substitute Martin Luther King for Jesus and then explain to African American students that this isn't hate speech.... Or maybe she could donate a portrait of her own mother being sodomized." Donohue also questioned why SFCC as a publicly funded institution was using tax payer money to sponsor "religious bigotry."[20] In response to the Donohue's accusations, Lambert echoed the responses of the panelists and cited First Amendment guarantees to freedom of expression. "One of the goals of this country," said Lambert "is to encourage and promote the free expression of ideas and the Constitution guarantees that right. So, while some people may not

believe that these particular exhibits [are] something they'll like to spend their tax dollars on, there are many other people who think it is an appropriate use of their dollars."[21]

The Catholic League was not the only religious organization to formally protest the exhibition. The Santa Fe River Baptists Association, based in Gainesville, adopted and sent a resolution to President Sasser protesting the exhibition. The resolution was signed by over one hundred members of the forty-five Southern Baptist churches in the North Central Florida area. Moreover, the Christian Coalition of Florida, based in Longwood, contacted Florida Governor Jeb Bush, the state's commissioner of education, and several state senators and representatives to express their displeasure with the exhibition.[22]

The growing outcry against the exhibition forced the college to enact a change in policy towards Gallery access and to alter the presentation of the exhibit. Visitors who wished to view the exhibit were required to show identification proving that they were over eighteen years of age. According to Lambert, "we thought it was a good step because we have some dual-enrolled high-school students on campus. It was a gray area because they are on a college campus, but on the other hand, we do respect the parents' choice to help them make decisions."[23] Additionally, during the college's Spring Break (March 4-8), the four most controversial images were removed (with the artist's permission) from the Gallery and placed across campus in Lambert's office.

The removal of works to a different exhibition space was in response to political pressure placed upon the college by Florida State Representative Bev Kilmer (R-Marianna). Even though Kilmer does not represent SFCC's service district, she was able to affect college policies because of her position as chair of the House Colleges and University committee and her service on the House Council for Lifelong Learning. According to Kilmer's account of the event, after holding separate meetings with President Sasser and Lambert, she went to the Gallery, chose the work that she wanted removed, and waited while they were taken from the walls and removed from the building.[24] Kilmer, who was contacted by "people concerned about the exhibit," noted (rather unconvincingly) that her actions did not constitute political censorship, but rather decency: "The state funds the colleges so that gives us a little bit of a right. But I think it's not even an issue of the state interfering, it's a common decency issue and I have no problem

with art, even these pieces, being in a private exhibit, but I don't think they have the kind of educational impact for art students that I would like to see them having."[25]

The moving of the works to another on-campus space received mixed reactions from off-campus organizations. The National Coalition Against Censorship (NCAC), while praising the college for not closing the entire exhibit, argued that "the removal of the work to a spot unrelated to the gallery…is an unfortunate concession to the pressure to censor disagreeable ideas, [and] in the long run, such a concession will not serve the College well: if a concession is made to the objections of one group, it would be hard not to make a concession again and again to accommodate everybody who disagrees with the ideas expressed in a play, a sculpture, a film, or painting shown on campus."[26] *The Gainesville Sun* viewed the action differently. By moving the work and maintaining access to it, the college was able to "negotiate a very thin line between access and censorship." Visitors who wished to see the four works were still able to do so, although they had "to go to some trouble to seek them out."[27]

The NCAC's criticism of the college does not take into account the fact that despite Kilmer's interference, the college kept the exhibit open and accessible, although in two separate locations. The NCAC also did not consider the fact that the college had a previous opportunity and more ideal occasion to close the entire exhibit even before Kilmer arrived on campus. Approximately one week after the exhibit opened, the building in which the Gallery was located was closed due to renovations. Access to the Gallery was maintained, however, via an external entrance that did not traverse the construction zone. Approximately two weeks later, the construction schedule necessitated closing the Gallery. Rather than use this opportunity as pretense to close the exhibit early, thereby effectively censoring the exhibit, the college chose to move all of the work to a temporary gallery space located across campus. While the space was not ideal for displaying artwork (linear wall space was less than the original Gallery and there was no way to control the lighting of the artwork), it did allow the exhibition to complete its scheduled run. Moreover, the space was enclosed such that no one who possibly may have been offended by the work could accidentally wander into the space. The college's actions as such protected the rights of the

artist, who was contractually guaranteed a venue to exhibit his work for a specified period of time, and the rights of the audience, both those who wished to view the work and those who did not.

Following Spring Break, further pressure was placed on the college by protestors picketing both the campus and the State Attorney's office in Gainesville. Protestors circulated a petition calling for the exhibit's removal. According to media reports, the petition had garnered over 2,000 signatures. Protestors also filed a complaint with SFCC's Police Department and called on State Attorney Bill Cervone to remove the entire exhibit on the basis of a Florida statute that prohibits exhibitions inappropriate for children from being within 2,500 feet of a secondary school. The legal complaints cited the "extremely pornographic" nature of the exhibit and the presence of dual-enrolled high school students on the SFCC campus.[28]

After an investigation, Cervone declined to pursue the complaint. His decision was based upon the test for "obscenity" established by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Miller v. California, 1973. According to the decision, the term "pornography" has no particular legal significance due to conflicting opinions about what can and cannot be considered pornographic. The legally significant term is "obscenity." In order for a work to be obscene, it must meet all parts of a three-part test: "(a) whether 'the average person, applying contemporary community standards' would find that the work, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest…, (b) whether the work depicts or describes, in a patently offensive way, sexual conduct specifically defined by the applicable state law, and (c) whether the work, taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value."[29] In a letter to the college explaining his justifications, Cervone wrote, "At the risk of oversimplifying a very complex area of the law, to be considered legally pornographic the material in question would have to wholly lack any serious artistic value. That is a standard that cannot be met with regard to these images."[30]

In response to the controversy, the Student Senate, the College Senate, and the Board of Trustees each passed resolutions and issued statements supporting the administration's defense of academic freedom and artistic expression. On March 20, the Student Senate passed a resolution supporting "the way they [the administration] handled the controversy surrounding this situation and for upholding the

value of academic freedom and our right of free expression by keeping the exhibit open for those individuals in our college and our community who chose to view it."[31]

The Student Senate resolution came one day after the Board of Trustees issued a resolution expressing support for Dr. Sasser's defense of academic freedom but disapproval over the exhibit. At the March 19 Board meeting, Trustee Winston J. Bradley intended to propose a motion to censor the exhibition. However, after discussion with the Board, Bradley agreed to "trust President Sasser…to handle the situation in return for a promise that something like this will not happen again." Trustee Bessie G. Jackson added that the Board "hired Dr. Sasser to be the leader of the school," but "we should let the community know that we as a Board strongly disapprove of this artwork." The Board's position was influenced by the SACS reaffirmation of accreditation process that college was currently undergoing. Academic freedom is written into the standards mandated by SACS. Dr. Sasser indicated that he thought censorship of the exhibit may have a negative impacted on SFCC's reaccredidation. [32]

Dr. Sasser received further support for his defense of the exhibition from the Executive Council of the College Senate. On March 26, the Executive Council commended Dr. Sasser "for his commitment to quality education during [the] recent controversy over artistic expression. Dr. Sasser preserved academic freedom and a diverse learning environment while remaining sensitive to all points of view and the right to dissent." The Executive Council also extended a commendation to the Board of Trustees for its support of Dr. Sasser. [33]

Throughout the controversy, Dr. Sasser and SFCC received praise from the local media for keeping the exhibit open. In separate editorials, the president and the college were commended for protecting academic freedom. *The Independent Florida Alligator*, the student-run newspaper of the University of Florida, praised the administration for the lesson it taught to students. "Allowing the show to remain is a matter of academic as well as artistic freedom," the editorial staff argued. "College is a time for students to explore and be exposed to many varied ideas. Controversial ideas spark intelligent debate and contribute to students' learning process." Similarly, *The Gainesville Sun* commended Dr. Sasser for

sending a clear message to the college's faculty, staff, and students that he is willing to defend academic freedom despite the costs to himself and to the college.[34]

Both editorials ended with advice to those who objected to the exhibit–if it may possibly offend you, you have the right not to go see the exhibit. These views echo statements made by Dr. Sasser to the media. In these statements, Dr. Sasser indicated that while he was personally offended by the work as a Christian, as president of the college it was his responsibility to defend and protect the institution's values. Dr. Sasser negotiated the conflict between personal and institutional values by electing *not* to expose himself to work he found personally objectionable while at the same time vigorously defending the artist's right to express his ideas and the Gallery's right to exhibit the work to those who wished to view it.

In his actions, Dr. Sasser provided a model for the college's Board of Trustees to emulate. During the March 19 Board meeting, Trustee Bradley argued that "this work does not deserve to be in this institution, and it is an outrage to most people who accept the Christian faith."[35] Trustees Jimmy Davis and Charles Perry agreed with Bradley's characterization of the art. However, the Board was moved by Dr. Sasser's defense that "to censor would send shock waves of uncertainty and fear… I put my personal and professional feelings in separate houses. This is about free speech."[36] By agreeing to rescind the call to censor the exhibit, the Board, especially Trustees Bradley, Davis, and Perry, put aside their personal values in defense of the institution's core values of "academic excellence, academic freedom, and intellectual pursuit."

In its editorial, *The Gainesville Sun* expressed hope that SFCC could avoid legislative interference as a result of the exhibition. Unfortunately, this would not be the case, given Representative Kilmer's position as chair of the House Committee on Colleges and Universities and her service on the Council for Lifelong Learning. During the April-May legislative session in which tax funds were appropriated to higher education, Representative Jerry Melvin (R-Fort Walton Beach), chair of the House Council for Lifelong Learning, sponsored a budget amendment that would reallocate $300,000 originally budgeted to SFCC to Daytona Beach Community College (DBCC). The amendment was approved (largely along

party lines) by the eighteen-member Committee on Colleges and Universities and entered into debate on the floor of the legislature. SFCC had planned to use these funds to help pay off a $1.6 million loan on a land purchase earmarked for future expansion of the campus. If the budget passed with Melvin's amendment, the college would have been forced to limit the number of scholarships it could award over the next two or three years.

When questioned about his motives, Melvin said, "I don't work in punishment. It was to make sure that each one got an equal amount of money for the purchase of properties."[37] DBCC President Kent Sharples, however, had not requested the funds and was "shocked" to learn that his college was receiving it. Moreover, Kilmer had stated on her website that she was "still evaluating further actions against the selection committee and possibly filing legislation to prevent this type of display to be placed in our public school systems in the future."[38] The funds taken from SFCC were from the Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO) program. PECO funds are awarded in priority order and are not usually subject to political maneuvering. Melvin's objections to the contrary, his actions were influenced by Kilmer and motivated by revenge over Dr. Sasser's refusal to remove the Payne exhibit from campus. Kilmer, again on her website, had noted her disappointment "in Dr. Sasser for allowing the pieces that were removed to continue to be shown in another part of the campus."[39]

Fortunately for SFCC, the legislature voted to restore the $300,000 to the college. In addition to the support it received from the Alachua County legislative delegation–Senator Rod Smith (D), Representative Ed Jennings (D), and Representative Perry McGriff (D)—SFCC received overwhelming support from the academic community in Florida. According to Dr. Sasser, "There was resounding support from all the colleges and universities, including Daytona Beach Community College, for the return of these funds to Santa Fe."[40]

Longer-term repercussions from the controversy will be seen in the art selection process and in the type of works displayed on campus. In exchange for the Board not issuing a resolution censoring the exhibit, Dr. Sasser promised that changes would be made to the process of selecting the works to be displayed on campus and that a controversy such as the one that had just occurred would not happen

again. Trustee Bessie Jackson had criticized the selection committee, comprised totally of visual arts faculty, for not having broad enough representation from the college and the community. "The decision of a few people has brought a negative impact on the college as a whole," she noted. "I hope more members of the college community will be involved in future considerations so as to avoid something like this from happening again."[41] Jackson's criticisms were valid, given the Gallery's mission to serve "as a teaching and learning resource for Santa Fe Community College students, faculty and staff, and the community at large." The committee process should include representation for all affected constituencies.

The committee was criticized also for failing to weigh the possible controversy that may have arisen due to the nature of the material, for failing to adequately communicate the exact nature of the artwork to those in the administration who would have been responsible for addressing the controversy, and for failing to provide their audience with educational materials that would have better explained the artist's intentions and would have possibly diffused some of the misunderstandings that contributed to the controversy. The selection committee's inexperience in professional gallery issues contributed to their lack of foresight concerning these issues. As visual arts faculty, the selection committee was concerned solely with the quality of the artistic technique and its possible use in teaching their art students. The pedagogical use of the exhibit for other "communities" was minimal at best, given the exhibit's lack of interpretation. The only interpretive material provided to the audience was a brief artist's statement printed as an introductory label and in a handout (see Appendix A). An exhibition of this nature required a more detailed artist's statement as well as interpretative labels for each work in the exhibit explaining Payne's technique, identifying the subjects of the background images (i.e., who are they, what is their story, and why are they traditionally seen in this fashion), and most importantly, explaining Payne's specific choices (i.e., why does he superimpose these two images; what meaning(s) did he intend to produce).[42]

One of the changes made in the aftermath of the controversy was in the composition of the selection committee. In addition to the visual arts faculty, the new committee includes several faculty, staff, and

administrators (including the former director of the Santa Fe Gallery) who have experience in the public presentation of art; the president of the College Senate; the director of News and Publications, the college's public relations arm; the college's graphic designer; the director of the college's endowment fund; the college's legal council; and Lambert, who will serve as Gallery curator. The purpose for adding non-arts faculty to the committee was to ensure that questions of audience suitability, pedagogical worth, timing, effects on the college and the community, possible community reactions, potential effects upon the college's ability to raise funds, etc. would be asked before an exhibition is launched. This new committee will continue to select artists for exhibition based upon a slide review of their work. However, in order to eliminate what had happened with the Pat Payne exhibit—that is, the artist delivering work that had not been reviewed just days before the exhibition—the work that will be exhibited in the Gallery must be the work represented in the slides the artist provided for review.[43]

Changes have also been made to the mission of the Gallery. It will no longer serve as a public gallery, but instead will be used as an alternative space-teaching gallery. The distinction made between a public gallery and a teaching gallery is in the composition of the audience and the notice given to the community concerning events taking place in the space. The Gallery's audience will be almost exclusively art students. The campus community and the community at large will no longer receive notices concerning upcoming and current exhibitions. In exchange for reduced exposure, the Gallery will enjoy the protections of a classroom space. Ward Scott, President of the College Senate, explains that in a teaching gallery, the audience is subjected to the standards of the classroom space. They may not impose their beliefs on that space.[44]

A visual arts faculty member has publicly stated that if work of Payne's caliber were to appear before the selection committee again, the arts faculty would have no problem launching an exhibition of this type again.[45] Lambert has also stated that the Gallery does not plan to avoid controversial exhibits.[46] Furthermore, various members of the selection committee have suggested that techniques and ideas will not be censored.[47] However, it would be highly unlikely for SFCC to sponsor any future exhibits that could be potentially controversial, given the composition of the committee, given the disapproval of the

Board of Trustees to the Payne exhibit, and given the costs to the college in terms of public relations, political good will, money paid for increased security for the exhibit (a campus police officer was stationed inside the Gallery to prevent incidents of vandalism), time dealing with the controversy and not dealing with other issues of importance to the college, and the loss of potential donations (funds that had been promised to the director of the college's endowment fund were withdrawn due to the subject matter of the exhibition). As has been the case after all art controversies, there will be a "chilling effect" on the display of art at SFCC.

SFCC's response to the controversy surrounding the Pat Payne exhibition closely followed practices suggested by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). In April 1990, in response to the growing number of arts censorship incidents occurring on college and university campuses across the country, the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the Wolf Trap Foundation sponsored a conference at the Wolf Trap Center for the Performing Arts in northern Virginia. The conference resulted in a position statement on academic freedom and artistic expression that was to serve as a guide for institutions in developing their own policies (see Appendix B).

The Wolf Trap statement contends that arts faculty and students are engaged in the pursuit of the institution's mission as much as their academic colleagues, and as such, deserve the same assurance of academic freedom as other faculty and students. Moreover, since artistic performances and exhibitions are crucial to the educational goals of arts disciplines, institutions should provide the same protections that are given to traditional classrooms to the studio, the stage, and the gallery space. While the responsibility for providing these protections lie with the institution, the faculty and their students bear full responsibility for using academic freedom professionally in pursuit of valid educational and artistic goals. Responsibility for the work of art itself lies with the artist. Institutions, according to the statement, *must* remain content-neutral and should not represent themselves as either supporting or denouncing the work or the artist. This same institutional-neutrality is practiced with more traditional classroom

instruction. The institution does not support nor denounce the content, views, or attitudes of educational material in academic lectures or books, and as such, should not support nor denounce the content, views, or attitudes of works of art produced by faculty, students, or outside artists. Correspondingly, those who present works of art should not represent themselves or their work as speaking for the institution, but rather should fulfill their educational and professional responsibilities to their audience. When an institution presents an exhibition/performance, they must ensure that the rights of the artist to present the work and the rights of the audience to experience the work are not interfered with by those who may be offended by the exhibition/performance. The statement does recognize the right of the institution to limit the spaces available for public exhibitions or performances. The choice to experience or not experience a presentation must be consciously made by the individual and not forced upon them. Finally, the institution does not relinquish its responsibility for protecting academic freedom just because it receives public funding. Institutions must resist governmental impositions on artistic expression, because censorship in any form denies both faculty and students the academic freedom to teach and to learn.

The attitude of the administration to academic freedom and freedom of artistic expression is the key component to its practice at an institution. In his study of attitudes towards academic freedom and artistic expression in the wake of the Wolf Trap conference, C. David Warner III notes, "The test of the administration during an art controversy is to decide whether to be true to the values of higher education and really involve all of their constituents in a learning discussion or to respond in a knee jerk fashion to either support the art or pull the plug."[48]

The SFCC administration supported the exhibit and allowed it to complete its run based upon principles of academic freedom. Even though four pieces were moved from the Gallery to a space across campus, access to the work was maintained, thereby protecting the rights of the artist and the rights of the audience who wished to view the work. The educational mission of the college was maintained and strengthened also by holding the panel discussion and by allowing protestors to picket the campus. These forums enabled people on both sides of the controversy to express their points of view. Furthermore, discussions within classrooms, the College Senate, the Student Senate, and the college's Board of

Trustees served educational purposes by enlightening students, faculty, staff, and administrators to the issues surrounding responsible academic freedom and freedom of artistic expression.

The manner in which the controversy was resolved is important to the continuing relationship between the college and the community. "[T]he resolution of the tension dictate[s] the relationship between the institution and the society at large. That is, will the institution play a leadership role in the community by upholding intellectual activity no matter how controversial, or will the partnership between town and gown be more collaborative, with the institution bringing forth only those forms of education the community requests?"[49] During the course of the controversy, the college played a leadership role by determining that the controversial art would be displayed on campus, yet it also collaborated with the community by providing forums that allowed diverse opinions on the exhibition to be expressed.

Perhaps the most important issue on which the college provided leadership was its defense of institutional values. The controversy over the Payne exhibit provided a forum for debate on the merits of academic freedom. Through their support of the exhibit, President Jackson Sasser, the Board of Trustees, the College Senate, and the Student Senate stated unequivocally to the North Central Florida and academic communities that the institution's values are not negotiable.

Appendix A: Pat Payne, Artist Statement from "Pat Payne: A Look at Violence in Religious and Sexual Imagery"

Artist Biography:
Pat Payne received an Art Degree from the University of Florida. He has exhibited his work in New York and Florida.

Artist Statement:
"I am trying to understand our species' propensity for violence and the degradation of others, and have noted that two common sources of depictions of that inhumanity are found in religious (specifically Catholic) and sexual imagery.

The idea for combining the two types of images came to me when, a few years ago at a NYC flea market, I looked through a box of old black & white bondage photos from the 1950's. I bought one that showed a woman whose arms were tied straight out from her sides in a crucifixion-like manner. My first image "blend" was an attempt to combine that image with the full-color image on the inside front cover of the Children's Missal I'd received in first grade, at age six—that of an emaciated, bloodied, dead man whose hands and feet were nailed to a cross.

I don't make these images to shock or offend, but to try to come to a better understanding of the concepts/perceptions of spirituality and sexuality, acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and images, veneration, arousal, morality, and objectification. The longer I've worked on this project, the more questions I've raised for myself. I'm hoping to get closer to understanding faith, true love, reverence, pleasure, eroticism, fear, control, power, and how and where any lines or boundaries get blurred or crossed or forgotten.

Technical Information:
The dates for the background images range from 1450 to 1800. For the sexual images, the dates range from the 1950's to the 1990's. Among the artists represented in the background images are Diego Velazquez, Edouard Manet, Giovanni Bellini, Bacchiacca, Hieronymus Bosch, Andrea Mantegna, Rembrandt, William Blake, Maerten van Heemskerck, and Rogier van der Weyden.

Appendix B: American Association of University Professor's Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression[50]

Attempts to curtail artistic presentations at academic institutions on grounds that the works are offensive to some members of the campus community and general public occur with disturbing frequency. Those who support restrictions argue that works presented to the public rather than in the classroom or other entirely intramural settings should conform to their view of the prevailing community standard rather than to standards of academic freedom. We believe that "essential as *freedom is for the relation and judgment of* facts, it is even more indispensable to the imagination."[1] In our judgment academic freedom in the creation and presentation of works in the visual and performing arts, by ensuring greater opportunity for imaginative exploration and expression, best serves the public and the academy.

The following proposed policies are designed to assist institutions to respond to the issues that may arise from the presentation of artistic works to the public in a manner which preserves academic freedom:

l) Academic Freedom in Artistic Expression. Faculty and students engaged in the creation and presentation of works of the visual and the performing arts are engaged in pursuing the mission of the university as much as are those who write, teach, and study in other academic disciplines. Works of the visual and performing arts are important both in their own right and because they can enhance our experience and understanding of social institutions and the human condition. Artistic expression in the classroom, studio, and workshop therefore merits the same assurance of academic freedom that is accorded to other scholarly and teaching activities. Since faculty and student artistic presentations to the public are integral to their teaching, learning, and scholarship, these presentations no less merit protection. Educational and artistic criteria should be used by all who participate in the selection and presentation of artistic works. Reasonable content-neutral regulation of the "time, place, and manner" of presentations should be developed and maintained. Academic institutions are obliged to ensure that regulations and procedures do not impair freedom of expression or discourage creativity by subjecting work to tests of propriety or ideology.

2) Accountability. Academic institutions provide artistic performances and exhibits to encourage artistic creativity, expression, learning, and appreciation. The institutions do not thereby endorse the specific artistic presentations nor do the presentations necessarily represent the institution. This principle of institutional neutrality does not relieve institutions of general responsibility for maintaining professional and educational standards, but it does mean that institutions are not responsible for the views or attitudes expressed in specific artistic works any more than they would be for the content of other instruction, publication, or invited speeches. Correspondingly, those who present artistic work should not represent themselves or their work as speaking for the institution and should otherwise fulfill their educational and professional responsibilities.

3) The Audience. When academic institutions offer exhibitions or performances to the public, they should ensure that the rights of the presenters and the audience are not impaired by a "heckler's veto" from those who may be offended by the presentation. Academic institutions should ensure that those who choose to view or attend may do so without interference. Mere presentation in a public place does not create a "captive audience." Institutions may reasonably designate specific places as generally available or unavailable for exhibitions or performances.

4) Public Funding. Public funding for artistic presentations and for academic institutions does not diminish (and indeed may heighten) the responsibility of the university community to ensure academic freedom and of the public to respect the integrity of academic institutions. Government imposition on artistic expression of a test of propriety, ideology, or religion is an act of censorship which impermissibly denies the academic freedom to explore, teach, and learn.

---

[1] Helen C. White, "Our Most Urgent Professional Task," AAUP Bulletin 45 (March 1959), 282.

Notes:

---

[1] This paper provided the basis for a presentation delivered at the 2002 Community College Humanities Association, Southern Division conference, held October 31-November 2 in Charleston, South Carolina. Special thanks must be given to Deborah Holmes-Howard, Professor of Humanities, who provided editorial assistance and assistance with the presentation. Special thanks also go to Dr. Curtis Jefferson, Associate Vice President, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Ed Bonahue, Chair of the Humanities and Foreign Languages Department; Mallory O'Connor, Professor of Art History; and Ward Scott, Professor of English and President of the College Senate. All agreed to be interviewed about their role and opinions concerning the events of the SFCC Art Gallery controversy and its aftermath. Thanks must also be given to Leslie Lambert, Chair of the Fine and Performing Arts Department, who supported this paper from its conception to its completion; the artist Pat Payne, who provided digital copies of his artwork to be used as part of our conference presentation; and Adam Henning, a news editor at WCJB TV-20 (Gainesville's local ABC affiliate) and a former SFCC student, who provided a video tape of his station's coverage of the controversy. Without their cooperation, this paper and its presentation at the CCHA conference would not have been possible.

[2] Doug Martin, "Artist's censorship show is censored," *Gainesville Sun*, January 31, 1998; and "Exhibit of Censored Works Is Censored Again," *ArtFBI Art Fax*, January 1998, p. 3-4, 10 October 2002, <http://www.outtacontext.com/Jan98.pdf>. The show was cancelled apparently under pressure from MCC President Sarah H. Pappas.

[3] Monica Steinhoff, "Press," 10 October 2002, <http://www.monikasteinhoff.com/press.htm>. The artist had originally gifted the painting to the college. The painting was returned to her in Spring 2001.

[4] Elizabeth Maupin, "College and Theater at Odds about Nudity," *Orlando Sentinel*, Sept. 28, 2000, p. D1. The college's sexual harassment and misconduct policy contains a no-nudity clause.

[5] John W. Allman, "Banned in Glendale, Community college literary magazine sparks right-wing censorship battle," *Phoenix New Times*, 14 June 2001, October 10, 2002, <http://www.phoenixnewtimes.com/issues/2001-06-14/news.html/1/index.html>. The work in question appeared in the 2000 edition of *The Traveler* and is available at the college's Traveler web site, <http://www.gc.maricopa.edu/English/trav20/cover.html>.

[6] Laura Stewart and Cindi Brownfield, "Photography Museum Director Resigns Over Afghanistan Exhibit," *Daytona Beach New-Journal*, 13 December 2001, October 10, 2002, <http://www.nieworld.com/special/hotcold/2001/protests1.htm>.

[7] "Harmony Clause in Miami Theatre Lease Strikes Some Sour Notes," Miami Herald, January 5, 2002, p. 3B.

[8] Pat Payne, Artist Statement, "Pat Payne: A Look at Violence in Religious and Sexual Imagery," February 8-March 29, 2002.

[9] *Ibid*.

[10] Cathi Carr, "Light shed on SFCC exhibit," *Gainesville Sun*, March 21, 2002, p. 1B+.

[11] *Ibid*.

[12] Joanna Clark, "Re: art gallery," E-mail to the author, March 13, 2002.

[13] "Jesus Shown Sodomized, Mutilated and Masturbated," Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, Press Release, February 28, 2002, 19 March 2002, <http://www.catholicleague.org/02press_releases/pr0102.htm#JESUS%20SHOWN%20SODOMIZED,%20MUTILATED%20&%20MASTURBATED>. The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights characterized the exhibit as "the Lenten treat that Santa Fe Community College has chosen to present to Christians."

[14] Leslie Lambert, "Re: art gallery," E-mail to the author, February 21, 2002.

[15] "Rule 1.05 Academic Freedom," *Santa Fe Community College Faculty Handbook*, 10 October 2002, <http://admin.sfcc.edu/%7Ehumresourc/policies/1_5.htm>.

[16] Clark, E-mail.

[17] "Santa Fe Gallery Mission Statement and History," <http://inst.sfcc.edu/~cah/gallery/history.html>.

[18] Ed Bonahue, "Re: CCHA Presentation," E-mail to the author, August 6, 2002.

[19] Figures from the 1990 US Census are used because comparable data from the 2000 Census have not yet been released as of October 2002.

[20] "Jesus Shown Sodomized, Mutilated and Masturbated." The Catholic League noted, however, that if the exhibit were in a private gallery, their opinions about the inappropriate nature of the art would remain the same.

[21] WUFT News 5 Broadcast News Story, March 1, 2002, Transcript, 20 June 2002, <http://www.wuft.tv/News5/Stories/ March%202002/art.html>.

[22] Janice Backer, "Protest Moves Art Show from Public View," *Florida Baptist Witness*, April 11, 2002, p. 6. President Sasser, who is an avowed Christian, also found the images offensive to his religion, but showed remarkable restraint, consistently citing his respect for his faculty's academic freedom and his freedom not to visit the exhibit and be confronted by Payne's images.

[23] Cathi Carr, "SFCC relocates controversial art," *Gainesville Sun*, March 12, 2002, p. 1A+.

[24] "A Time to Evaluate our Faith," Bev Kilmer, Florida State Representative, District 7, 16 April 2002, <http://www.bevkilmer.com/article.php/55/1/>. According to college spokesperson Larry Keen, Kilmer's recollection of the events is flawed and it was the college's decision to move the work. See: Tom McLaughlin, "Fiery Lawmaker Likely to Become a More Familiar Face to the Area," *Northwest Florida Daily News*, April 1, 2002, p. A1+.

[25] Victoria Langley, "Lawmaker Removes Controversial Artwork," *Capitol News Service*, April 2, 2002, 16 April 2002, <http://www.flanews.com/april/0402Art.htm>. Kilmer has never worked as an arts educator. Her degree is from the Matrix Institute of Business. Prior to her election in 1998, Kilmer had worked as a cosmetologist who operated three beauty salons in Quincy, Florida.

[26] "Censorship, not Curatorial Discretion," National Coalition Against Censorship, 21 August 2002, <http://www.ncac.org/ issues/patpayne.html>.

[27] "The Thin Line, Santa Fe Community College President Jackson Sasser Has Negotiated the Thin Line Between Access and Censorship Well," Editorial, *Gainesville Sun*, March 13, 2002, p. 12A.

[28] Cathi Carr, "Artistic License, Exhibit Mixes Jesus with Sexual Images," *Gainesville Sun*, March 20, 2002; WCJB TV-20, ABC Broadcast News Story, March 12, 2002; and WCJB TV-20, ABC Broadcast News Story March 18, 2002.

[29] "U.S. Supreme Court MILLER v. CALIFORNIA, 413 U.S. 15 (1973)," Findlaw for Legal Professionals, 10 October 2002, <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=413&invol=15>.

[30] Carr, "Artistic License, Exhibit Mixes Jesus with Sexual Images."

[31] Cathi Carr, "SFCC Students Support Keeping Art Exhibit Open," *Gainesville Sun*, March 22, 2002, 20 June 2002, <http://gainesvillesun.com/articles/2002-03-22m.shtml>.

[32] David S. Wisener, "Trustees: Sexual, Religious Art Has No Place at SFCC," *The Independent Florida Alligator*, March 20, 2002, 30 July 2002, <http://www.alligator.org/edit/news/issues/02-spring/020320/b05sfcc20.html>. Ed Bonahue, chair of the SACS reaffirmation process, believed that the controversy had no impact on the results of the accreditation process. During the SACS visit, he informed the visiting committee that the college was currently sponsoring an art exhibit that had proven extremely controversial on campus and in the community. He summarized the events of the controversy, including the fact that the college had held a public forum, that there had been coverage of the controversy in the local media, and that the president stood by the exhibit as an example of academic freedom and had no intention of closing the exhibit. See: Ed Bonahue, E-mail.

[33] SFCC College Senate Resolution, 21 August 2002, <http://inst.sfcc.edu/~senate/SENRESOL.HTM>.

[34] "The Thin Line, Santa Fe Community College President Jackson Sasser Has Negotiated the Thin Line Between Access and Censorship Well" and "The War of Art," Editorial, *The Independent Florida Alligator*, March 21, 2002, 30 July 2002, <http://www.alligator.org/edit/opinion/issues/02-spring/020321/c01eddyb.html>.

[35] Wisener, "Trustees: Sexual, Religious Art Has No Place at SFCC."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[36] "News from the District Board of Trustees, SFCC Upholds Academic Freedom in Art Exhibition," *Santa Fe Report*, Vol. 11, No. 7, April 26, 2002.
[37] Ashley Rowland, "Santa Fe Faces Art Backlash," *Gainesville Sun*, May 2, 2002, 30 July 2002, <http://www.gainesvillesun.com/articles/2002--5-02b.shtml>.
[38] "A Time to Evaluate our Faith".
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] Kathy Ciotola, Panel restores SFCC funds," May 11, 2002, 30 July 2002, <http://www.gainesvillesun.com/articles/2002-05-11d.shtml>.
[41] Wisener, "Trustees: Sexual, Religious Art Has No Place at SFCC."
[42] Mallory O'Connor, Interview with author, August 20, 2002.
[43] O'Connor, Interview, and Ward Scott, Interview with author, August 22, 2002.
[44] Scott, Interview
[45] Carr, "Light shed on SFCC exhibit."
[46] "SFCC Art Display Comes Under Fire," *SFCC Saint Sentinel*, April 2002, p. 2+
[47] O'Connor, Interview, and Scott, Interview.
[48] C. David Warner III, *Opinions of Administrators, Faculty, and Students Regarding Academic Freedom and Students Artistic Expression*, Mellon Studies in Education, Vol. 63 (Edwin Mellon Press), p. 138.
[49] Bonahue, E-mail.
[50] "American Association of University Professors' Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression," *American Association of University Professors*, 10 October 2002, <http://www.eff.org/CAF/academic/artistic.freedom.aaup>

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Controversial Art in the Community College

Author(s): Bobby Hom, Asst. Prof., Humanities, Santa Fe Community College

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Bobby Hom Asst. Prof., Humanities
Organization/Address: Santa Fe Community College, 3000 NW 83rd St., K-246, Gainesville, FL 32606	Telephone: 352 395 9141 / FAX:
	E-Mail Address: bobby.hom@sfcc.edu / Date: 9/3/03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC®
Clearinghouse For
Community Colleges

University of California, Los Angeles
3051 Moore Hall
Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521

EE 45

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)